



FINAL REPORT
AND SUMMARY OF THIRD ROUND OF WORKSHOPS
FOR WYOMING GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT

THE PLATTE VALLEY MULE DEER HERD INITIATIVE
COLLABORATIVE LEARNING PROCESS

Jessica Clement, Ph.D.

Social Scientist in Natural Resource Management

Collaboration and Environmental Conflict Resolution Practitioner

Jessica.clement@mail.com

Final Report and General Synopsis of the Platte Valley Mule Deer Herd Initiative

In May 2011 WGFD decided to speed up its initiation of a collaborative process with Platte Valley constituents regarding the mule deer herds in that area. There were, and still are, serious concerns regarding the declining numbers of mule deer in the Platte Valley, there were conflicting opinions and information regarding remedies, and stakeholders had voiced concerns regarding mule deer management in the Valley for many years. WGFD decided that the appropriate public participation method for unraveling the information and to allow all constituents to learn from and with each other as well as from and with the agency itself, was a collaborative learning process.

A process that is collaborative seeks to find a way for all types of stakeholders to "co-labor", to work together to create progress on an issue. One definition used in this process is "A process in which interdependent parties work together to affect the future of an issue of shared interests" (Daniels and Walker, 2001).

Five features characterize a collaborative process:

1. Stakeholders are interdependent.
2. Solutions emerge by dealing constructively with differences that otherwise would not.
3. Joint ownership of decisions is involved.
4. Stakeholders assume collective responsibility for the future direction of the situation.
5. Collaboration is an emergent property.

To unravel complex sets of information in a way that can be considered legitimate and trustworthy by a diverse group of stakeholders with different missions, values and concerns, collaborative learning is used as the mechanism to drive a process forward. Collaborative learning is:

1. A framework and set of techniques intended for multi-stakeholder learning and decision situations.
2. It means designing and implementing events (meetings, field trips, etc.) to promote creative thought, constructive debate and effective implementation of proposals.
3. Appropriate when there are multiple stakeholders who are interdependent and independent.
4. Suitable for NRM situations that contain:
 - a. conflict and
 - b. complexity.

I worked with the WGFD, and the Laramie Region in particular, to design a collaborative process that would lend itself to the types of stakeholders involved, the landscape, and the issue and related sub-issues. I worked with a team of WGFD professionals, which consisted of the Chief of the Wildlife Division, the Assistant Chief of the Wildlife Division, the Chair of the Wyoming

Mule Deer Initiative, the Laramie Region Supervisor and associated wildlife biologists and game wardens from Saratoga, Rawlins, Elk Mountain, Lander and the wildlife biologist from Baggs (15 people). We created three sets of workshops, which were held in four locations each time: Saratoga, Rawlins, Laramie and Cheyenne. Saratoga is the largest town in the Platte Valley with an excellent community center in which to hold meetings for large numbers of people. Rawlins is in the same county, where some Platte Valley residents and many hunters live. Laramie and Cheyenne are close enough for residents to have long associations with the Platte Valley as hunters and other types of recreationists.

Each workshop, a total of 12, was held in the evening to allow as many participants as possible to join in deliberations and learning. The first set of workshops took place in August 2011, the second in November 2011 and the last set of workshops in February 2012 (summary attached. Summaries for the first and second sets of workshops have been submitted and can be found on the WGFD Platte Valley Mule Deer website). Participation numbers were 124 for the first workshops, 153 for the second and 112 for the third workshops, 389 participants total. The last set of workshops took place during a period of heavy winter weather and winds, making roads treacherous and decreasing participation. Considering the weather conditions which extreme even for Wyoming, participation numbers testify to the importance of this issue to constituents.

Each workshop consisted of initial provision of information prepared by WGFD staff members and time for questions. This was followed by break out groups where participants discussed the information they just heard with each other and with WGFD staff, then formulated issue statements during Workshop 1, improvements during Workshop 2, and helped finalize the draft plan with WGFD during Workshop 3. These comments were captured during the break out groups, then presented by a member of the public at the last session of the evening. All workshops were rounded off with question time and written evaluations. All flipchart notes and evaluations are posted on the WGFD website, as well as all presentations and written comments.

Between the November and February workshops, I created two internal decision-making workshops and facilitated two plan document review meetings to facilitate the internal decision-making that had to take place before the draft plan could be created.

This team systematically looked at the public's input from the second set of workshops which consisted of improvements that were suggested. All suggestions were categorized, reviewed and strategies were drafted to meet as many of the suggestions as possible. The team looked at results from the random sample social science survey that had been completed in 2011 specifically regarding the Platte Valley mule deer herd, and relevant biological data, and regulations and laws. Within the decision space that emerged, created by social, regulatory and biological parameters, the team drafted strategies for implementation based directly on public input. These strategies are described in detail in the plan. If suggestions could not be followed by the Department, there is an appendix in the plan that provides an explanation for it not being included.

As a result of this collaborative process, the Department has completed a first iteration of a mule deer plan for the Platte Valley. The plan lends itself well to adaptive management, because it is firmly grounded in public deliberations and informed suggestions. This plan, coupled with continued collaboration, provides a platform for the Department to continue its learning with Platte Valley stakeholders regarding mule deer management.

Another outcome of this process is the Department's desire to initiate what they are describing as a "Platte Valley Habitat Partnership" which would provide a process where in-depth learning and joint problem-solving would be possible to improve habitat conditions in the Platte Valley for mule deer and other species. This Partnership will be started May 17 and 18th, 2012 in Saratoga. It will be a multiple stakeholder collaborative process, that will look at various types of information and data to learn about habitat conditions, the geography and ecology of the Platte Valley landscape, and collaboratively formulate a habitat plan based on common understandings of the conditions and suitable remedies. This plan can serve again as an adaptive management tool to guide ongoing habitat discussions and very importantly, active management on the ground.

Lastly, when looking at the evaluations over the course of the three sets of workshops, it is clear that the Department has made important strides toward starting an ongoing and rich conversation with constituents. This conversation is possible because stakeholders, including members of the Department, have listened to each other, deliberated with each other and gradually increased common understandings of the issues, and trust. It is understood by all involved that there is more work to be done to continue this improvement in trust and connectivity. But the Platte Valley Mule Deer Herd Initiative, thanks to WGFD's efforts and all the members of the public who came to one but more often all the workshops, has brightened the prospects for the improvement of the condition of the mule deer herd considerably.

It has been a great pleasure to serve the Wyoming Game and Fish Department and its stakeholders. Thank you for allowing me to make a contribution to and learn more about the beautiful State of Wyoming.

Sincerely,

Jessica M. Clement, Ph.D.
May 3, 2012

Summary of Third Set of Workshops

This summary documents the process that was utilized during the third round of WGFD's Platte Valley Mule Deer Herd Initiative's collaborative process and is the final report on the entire process. The management plan has at time of writing of this summary been approved by the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission in March 2012. See information regarding the Platte Valley Mule Deer Initiative at the following WGFD website:

<http://wgfd.wyo.gov/web2011/wildlife-1000399.aspx>

Four workshops were held to present the draft plan during the Platte Valley Mule Deer Initiative Collaborative Learning process February 21 through the 24th, 2012. The agenda followed the same format in each location (see Appendix A). After introductions and words of welcome from Tom Ryder (Assistant Chief, Wildlife Division) and Jessica Clement (Collaboration Process design and facilitation), short presentations were presented regarding the draft plan based on the improvements suggested by the public during the second set of workshops. These improvements were collapsed into six main categories:

- Public Participation
- Habitat
- Population Management,
- Access
- Disturbance
- Outreach, partnerships and WGFD Responsiveness.

Participants were then randomly distributed into break-out groups where they discussed the draft plan, concentrating on what factors would make future collaboration possible, missing items in the plan and feedback on the present collaboration as well as any other general comments. Each group was facilitated by a WGFD staff member, with another WGFD staff member or break out participant taking notes. After a short break, all participants reconvened in the main meeting area and a member of each break-out group reported the priority improvements back to the larger group. The last part of the meeting was dedicated to an open question and answer time, followed by next steps.

The four meeting locations were Saratoga, Rawlins, Laramie and Cheyenne. Below are short descriptions of participant numbers and results of the evaluations. The evaluation sheets were filled in by all participants and contained five questions:

1. What did you feel worked well with this third workshop?
2. Is there anything about this workshop that could have been done better? If so what?
3. Do you feel Jessica created a positive environment that allows for everyone to participate on mule deer issues? If so, why? If not, why not?

4. Any other comments or suggestions for future workshops?
5. Any other comments or suggestions regarding the Platte Valley Mule Deer Initiative Draft Plan?

One of the main outcomes of this collaborative process is the initiation by WGFD of the "Platte Valley Habitat Partnership" and the continuation of the "Platte Valley Mule Deer Initiative". Under the former, WGFD hopes to facilitate the start of an independent, diverse stakeholder collaborative process that is transparent and addresses habitat issues on a landscape scale for mule deer and other species. Under the PVMDI, WGFD has committed to a number of population management actions that will need to be monitored, collaboratively deliberated and possibly adapted over time, and will therefore continue into the future. For the same of informing both these collaborative processes, I have included all comments from the evaluations, as well as all comments to the plan that were documented on flipchart sheets during the workshops (Appendix B).

Saratoga

Participants: 55

QUESTION 1 COMMENTS	What did you feel worked well with this third workshop?
1	Good balance between presentation and workshop exercises.
2	Intro, breakout session, regrouping larger session (with non-G&F personnel presenting breakout notes). Jessica is non-threatening and fabulous moderator.
3	Everyone was given time to ask questions and comment, main points of break-out groups were well summarized for everyone to hear.
4	Writing the draft plan. Asking what was missed. We're getting to know and trust one another.
5	Breakout groups worked well. People more willing to share ideas and discuss. X 2
6	Having a draft available to read and comment.
7	Explanation of draft plan.
8	Same as other 2 meetings.
9	We have information we could talk about tonight.
10	More talk about changing to Limited Quota.
11	It was direct and to the point.
12	We had the summary of the actual plan to work off of- that helped. Everyone had a chance to be heard.
13	We are getting closer to getting something done to improve our deer herds.
14	Small breakout groups. X 5
15	More discussion.
16	Agreeable communication.

17	Group participation.
18	Same as all the others- we had an opportunity to be heard.
19	Well organized. Good participants. Speakers well informed.
20	Great facilitator.
21	Break out groups again.
22	Most of it.

QUESTION 2 COMMENTS		Is there anything about this workshop that could have been done better? If so, what?
1		Could be clearer as to what specific output is wanted from the breakout sections. Assign people to breakout groups BEFORE telling where the groups will meet so we can make it a point to remember the one location we need to get to.
2		Break out was not as good as 1st and 2nd.
3		I believe that it was handled well.
4		Better audio system.
5		In the break off group, one person dominated and the Game Warden barely listened to anybody.
6		Have explanation of why certain things have been left out of the plan- not at a later date because maybe we will never get that info!
7		Facilitate new participants so old things will not be brought up again.
8		We thought it was well planned and great involvement.
9		I think it went very well. X 3
10		Start showing in the future how the plan is being implemented and successes achieved.
11		Get more people if possible.
12		Need for time lines.
13		No. x 2
14		Not have it. The expenditure of these funds should be going to the "on ground problem."
15		More specifics during presentation. Someone to take notes during 1st section of questions when we were in a large group. Who captured this?
16		I'm generally impressed with the workshop.
17		Don't spend so much time indoctrinating people on habitat. Read the 3 Bar Mule Deer study in Arizona. With the highest density of lion here in North America. Talk about predation.
18		More time in the break out group- we could have used another half hour! We were told not to discuss the season dates- but it should have been part of the conversation.
19		More explanation earlier in process (1st and 2nd mtg) about what is a habitat improvement for mule deer; population, fawn ratio, buck ratio changes over time, when predator control works, comparison of general & limited quota.
20		Break out group went off-topic.

QUESTION 3 COMMENTS	Do you feel Jessica created a positive work environment that allows for everyone to participate on mule deer issues? If so, why? If not, why not?
1	Yes- the continued reinforcement of rules for participation with emphasis on collaborative decision making is needed to keep us from falling into old confrontational habits.
2	Yes, tried to keep on track. X 6
3	Yes. X 8
4	Yes, positive environment. Jessica- you really micromanage the presenter for your group- you probably don't need to.
5	Yes- she was nonjudgemental and set up a nonthreatening environment that encouraged people to speak their minds. X2
6	Jessica did a great job. Very important to not have G&F person in this role- not biased from dept. or public perspective.
7	Yes. But not enough time is spent on individual participation. Too much time is spent by the Dept. talking. We are not 2nd graders.
8	Yes, she is cute for a greenie!
9	Yes, she made sure she knew exactly what the people were talking about.
10	Yes, she was very knowledgeable and is able to get public involved.
11	She did well on creating a positive forum that allowed everyone to participate in.
12	Yes- continued chance for dialogue
13	Yes, group interaction for variance of opinions.
14	Jessica was very positive and encouraged open dialogue
15	Yes, small groups.
16	Yes, that's what she is paid to do.
17	Yes- Jessica strives to understand issues and comments. She keeps on task. Jessica explains the process for future success.
18	When Jessica says, "You guys," she means G&F as well as everyone else, on equal terms. She does not present herself as "from the G&F side."
19	Yes, took the attack on the WGFD away so focus could be on the herd.

QUESTION 4 COMMENTS	Any other comments or suggestions for future workshops?
1	It might be good to have another workshop discussing the final plan and the associated comment response document. Might want another on initial steps toward actual implementation of the plan.
2	Its possible that the upper Platte Valley is learning to be more collaborative. Applying these skills to other issues is extremely positive.
3	Put group (breakout) on name tags when people walk into meeting. Otherwise, some people just went to a group together so that their opinion was the majority.

4	Give the public more time to speak, even if the talk is timed individually. When we were allowed to comment and it was against the general Dept. opinion it was rebuffed. We were told in the beginning to talk about good, bad or ugly but the Dept. didn't want to hear the ugly.
5	Do not have any. Let the Wyo G&F manage for what they have been hired for!!
6	We need to be active in having more meetings.
7	Keep having them- as a way to let people know they can/are involved in process.
8	Have them often- get more specific ex. Habitat height, management strategies etc.
9	Start creating pannel and work force volunteers to do actual work.
10	Somehow get more public involved.
11	Better advertisement.
12	Need to be able to start acting on projects.
13	Continue having them, more involvement with Forest Service and BLM.
14	No. x 2
15	Some actual and probably drastic things need to happen as a result of THIS set of workshops- or there will be NO future workshops.
16	More attendance by Forest Service, BLM, NRCS, State Lands representatives.
17	Post study results for public to see them. Have a public meeting on how to address results i.e. habitat monitoring, deer counts, interspecies competition.
18	Keep it up. X 5
19	Keep wearing the street clothes. Maintain non-defensive attitude.

QUESTION 5 COMMENTS	Any other comments or suggestions regarding the Platte Valley Mule Deer Initiative Draft Plan?
1	Offer examples of possible habitat improvement actions that have worked so participants can better understand and offer their own specific suggestions. The angel will be in the detail of on-the-ground habitat improvement actions.
2	I think we need to be patient. Declining mule deer numbers have been a long-term trend. Positive results are going to take time.
3	Get away from the idea that burning and chemical treatment are "enhancements."
4	Just keep things moving, it is a good start.
5	No. X 2
6	Shorten the season for 2012 to reduce 2012 harvest get RID of the game model now used, it is INACCURATE the sightability flying proved that.
7	I disagree with the whole Initiative process. I believe we have good people within the G&F. Let them manage!! We do not need to be spending these kind of funds on this.
8	Need to address competition for habitat with elk- Elk in the area have increased dramatically over the past few years as deer numbers have decreased.
9	Let general public get more involved.
10	Lions are not the problem.
11	Thanks.
12	Get Colorado to assist.

13	There was no definition or explanation on what a "habitat easement" is? No one seemed to know.
14	Under the heading of inter-agency cooperation, see how NRCS funding for sage grouse conservation can have a multiple effect, or at least a complementary benefit.
15	If private property habitat is to be improved how much money will the landowners have to put toward the project? There isn't money coming from the landowner on public properties.
16	Could you get extra money for habitat from the Forest Service, by way of a dollar or 2 from firewood permits, since everyone is cleaning up beetle kill, helping habitat.
17	Please make sure that this plan becomes final and doesn't sit on the shelf! Thank you!
18	The proof is in the pudding. Is the G&F truly responsive to the public participation (particularly, Platte Valley participants concerns)

Rawlins

Participants: 18

QUESTION 1 COMMENTS	What did you feel worked well with this third workshop?
1	The whole process.
2	The structure works well.
3	Breakout groups generate personal involvement/thoughts.
4	Not to well.
5	There was more knowledgeable information than the second meeting.
6	The open exchange of MORE ideas.
7	Organized- facilitator kept on track.

QUESTION 2 COMMENTS	Is there anything about this workshop that could have been done better? If so, what?
1	I don't think so. X 2
2	Listen to science members better or experts.
3	Coffee.

QUESTION 3 COMMENTS	Do you feel Jessica created a positive work environment that allows for everyone to participate on mule deer issues? If so, why? If not, why not?
1	Yes, to break the big group into smaller groups so everyone can speak their mind
2	Break out sessions get more people involved.
3	Yes, did a great job- keeping involvement and directed.
4	Yes. X 4

QUESTION 4 COMMENTS	Any other comments or suggestions for future workshops?
1	Keep having them and email about all upcoming G&F meetings.
2	Good work- Don't stop now!/ Continue with them

QUESTION 5 COMMENTS	Any other comments or suggestions regarding the Platte Valley Mule Deer Initiative Draft Plan?
1	I like the plan very much.
2	It's on the boards.

Laramie

Participants: 22

QUESTION 1 COMMENTS	What did you feel worked well with this third workshop?
1	Public input was great. X 3
2	Cooperation and presentation.
3	Format and setup- Good
4	Good collaboration, good start point.
5	A lot of input from everyone.
	Everything was good x 2

QUESTION 2 COMMENTS	Is there anything about this workshop that could have been done better? If so, what?
1	Publicity- posters/contact with MDF Committee/ RMEF Committee/ Turkey and Ducks Unlimited.
2	Longer- needed more time.
3	No x 3
4	Explain more about what happened at prior meetings.

QUESTION 3 COMMENTS	Do you feel Jessica created a positive work environment that allows for everyone to participate on mule deer issues? If so, why? If not, why not?
1	Yes x 7
2	I feel that a facilitator is very important. Jessica did a fine job and has good knowledge of objectives.
3	Yes, she keeps people on point.
4	Yes. Open to questions from the public.

QUESTION 4 COMMENTS	Any other comments or suggestions for future workshops?
1	Earlier start. Time Line?
2	Better advertising.
3	Find and designate a few local volunteers to be in charge of notifying other locals of upcoming meetings.
4	Better and longer advertising. i.e. Paper, radio, posters, local TV info channels, etc.
5	More open discussion with the group as a whole.
6	Follow up with actions taken. Develop groups.
7	Yes.

QUESTION 5 COMMENTS	Any other comments or suggestions regarding the Platte Valley Mule Deer Initiative Draft Plan?
1	I would like a draft plan.
2	Keep everybody involved.
3	Get to the East side (Laramie River) quickly.
4	I agree with everything.
5	No.

Cheyenne

Participants: 17

QUESTION 1 COMMENTS	What did you feel worked well with this third workshop?
1	I didn't get to make it to the previous two, but you could tell the public felt a cause and were not afraid to participate. That's encouraging.
2	The taking of all comments (good and bad) was considered. I was able to get different perspectives on the mule deer initiative.
3	The controlled discussion certainly provided for great comments and insight into the problem.
4	The group meetings.
5	Very well run meeting.
6	Was able to give input.
7	Very good input from the public as well as the Game and Fish personnel.
8	Very good discussion on all topics.
9	Reviewing accumulated information.
10	The partnership of all who participated.
11	Good balance of input and collaboration.
12	Most Game&Fish staff were very welcoming, made participants feel valued for their input.
13	Well designed.
14	Everything was well done.

QUESTION 2 COMMENTS	Is there anything about this workshop that could have been done better? If so, what?
1	Well run! I like that there was a facilitator used.
2	None. X 3
3	Great meeting. X 2
4	Fridays are not so good.
5	More publicity could have increased participation.
6	Where was the bell for side-board conversations?
7	Not that I know of, except better advertising.

QUESTION 3 COMMENTS	Do you feel Jessica created a positive work environment that allows for everyone to participate on mule deer issues? If so, why? If not, why not?
1	Yes. She has a easy, approachable attitude.
2	Yes, true professional.
3	Yes. The moderators controlled those that had an inclination to dominate.
4	Jessica allowed comments from all, within the time constraints she had to work with.
5	She has done a great job.
6	Yes. X 5
7	Extremely positive.
8	NO. Tone was patronizing, bordered on rude. Also, calling out individuals and "ordering" them into separate groups, very inappropriate. A REQUEST would have been appreciated. This is not kindergarten.
9	Yes. Kept discussions moving forward and on point.
10	Yes, she made sure everyone was involved.

QUESTION 4 COMMENTS	Any other comments or suggestions for future workshops?
1	Have more advertising through different media outlets.
2	None. X 2
3	Keep doing this. X 3

QUESTION 5 COMMENTS	Any other comments or suggestions regarding the Platte Valley Mule Deer Initiative Draft Plan?
1	Very well run.
2	Has aerial imagery and analysis been considered for habitat analysis? Ex: ultralight aircraft with strong cameras (800mm). I know USDA-ARS has developed a program (Sample-Point) to analyze forage in vast habitats.
3	I expressed mine.
4	None.
5	Thank you all for all the hard work.

6	Educational efforts need to be stepped up and expanded.
7	I feel that it is important to Wyoming wildlife.

Below the reader will find the agenda that was followed during the third workshops, and the comments that were captured on flipcharts by the moderators in each break out group which helped refine the first iteration of the Platte Valley Mule Deer Management Plan.

Submitted by Jessica Clement, Ph.D.

May 3, 2012



Appendix A
Wyoming Game and Fish
Platte Valley Mule Deer Management Plan
Collaborative Learning Process
Third Workshop Agenda

21-24 February, 2012
6:00 – 9:00 pm

Third Workshop Objectives:

1. Present Main Strategies from Draft Plan
2. Provide further information regarding the Platte Valley Mule Deer Herd.
3. Small group break outs to clarify and discuss collaborative strategies for the future.
4. Determine next steps

- | | | |
|------|---|------------|
| I. | Introductions
Tom Ryder, Jessica Clement | 10 minutes |
| II. | Presentations on Main Strategies

Time for Questions – 20 minutes | 45 minutes |
| III. | Break –Out Groups <ul style="list-style-type: none">• General comments and suggestions to the Plan.• What did we miss?• What could continued habitat collaboration look like in the future? Get specifics.• What did you like/dislike about this process? | 60 minutes |
| IV. | Break-Out Group reports | 20 minutes |
| V. | General Discussion and Evaluations | 20 minutes |

Appendix B: Break Out Groups Comments on the Draft Plan

Third Workshop Comments Summary

Location	# of Comments Total	General Comments	Comments on missing items in Draft Plan	Comments on Future Collaboration	Comments regarding the current Collaborative Process	Comments regarding the 2012 Season
Saratoga	151	91	11	24	22	3
Rawlins	61	27	11	14	8	0
Laramie	69	31	4	17	17	0
Cheyenne	78	59	7	11	1	1
Total	359	208	33	66	48	4

Location	Discussion Point	Comment
FC = Future Collaboration. GC = General Comment. M = Missing in the Plan. P=Present Collaboration.		
Cheyenne	2012	2012 General Season - do what we can to reduce harvest - more deer for future.
Saratoga	2012	2012 Season: shorter season - limited quota
Saratoga	2012	2012 season: after season meeting - evening meetings are a good thing.
Saratoga	2012	"Gold standard" of limited quota: as restrictive as possible - 2013 short season with limited quota. - 2012 short season.
Cheyenne	FC	Ask federal agencies for a commitment (personnel) and identify/assign person to PVHP.
Cheyenne	FC	Make sure we are coordinating with others so we do not re-invent the wheel. Make sure we use research that has already been done.
Cheyenne	FC	Provide better volunteer opportunity. Example: adopt a vegetation transect program. Engage public in the process!
Cheyenne	FC	Print-out of issues list from workshop #1 needed at Workshop #2
Cheyenne	FC	Advertising/notification is still an issue.
Cheyenne	FC	Don't forget paper/radio non-tech advertising.
Cheyenne	FC	Meet a couple of times a year. Winter/after winter - spring.
Cheyenne	FC	Communicate back to where we re on reaching our management goals - what do we need from the public?
Cheyenne	FC	Like the partnerships.
Cheyenne	FC	Likes the meetings/process.
Cheyenne	FC	Habitat focus.
Laramie	FC	Get entities/agencies together
Laramie	FC	Organize volunteer projects
Laramie	FC	Aerial seeding
Laramie	FC	Monitor/inventory is important
Laramie	FC	Partnerships are important.
Laramie	FC	Look to civic groups such as Rotary for help - partnerships
Laramie	FC	Continue to have meetings for public input.
Laramie	FC	Get more involved with NGO's.
Laramie	FC	More volunteer opportunities.
Laramie	FC	Get "buy-in" with public on management efforts.
Laramie	FC	Eliminate barriers for projects.
Laramie	FC	Need specific person for liaison with NGO's.
Laramie	FC	Need better explanation of what projects will do for deer.
Laramie	FC	Please apply process to other herds around the state.
Laramie	FC	Small working group including volunteers, WGFD, agencies to work towards implementation of the plan.
Laramie	FC	Also WGFD talks with USFS, BLM about travel management.

Location	Discussion Point	Comment
FC = Future Collaboration. GC = General Comment. M = Missing in the Plan. P=Present Collaboration.		
Laramie	FC	Collaborate with CO on herd management.
Laramie	FC	Need a better way to communicate about meetings, plans. Have a few locals that could pass information along. Use emails from license database Posters at fly stores, banks etc. like RMEF etc.
Rawlins	FC	Get together with OHV and sportsmen's groups to talk about where to go/not go - decrease disturbance. Proactive - target specific groups.
Rawlins	FC	Working groups to help plan go, rotate people on/off
Rawlins	FC	Need email list to remind about meetings - any WGFD meeting.
Rawlins	FC	Meet minimum of 1 time/year
Rawlins	FC	Meet one time after hunting season to gather information and then again with recommendations (spring).
Rawlins	FC	Tie education to meetings.
Rawlins	FC	Bring in and include other experts for help/suggestions e.g. T. Messner, Dan....., R. Roach for PVHP
Rawlins	FC	Government by committee can take time, especially if done by consensus: have a steering committee
Rawlins	FC	More involvement with economic development organizations
Rawlins	FC	PVHP involvement with industrial siting council.
Rawlins	FC	Seek funding sources from industry e.g. Devon Industry (sp?) or BP
Rawlins	FC	Collaboration with federal agencies, state and land owners.
Rawlins	FC	Where do we draw the line between doing research and getting stuff done on the ground. At some point we need to do some management.
Rawlins	FC	Ways to advertize future meetings: Chamber of Commerce/Newspaper community calendar.
Rawlins	FC	Other collaborative efforts planned?
Saratoga	FC	Support interagency cooperation - also related to travel management and OHV's.
Saratoga	FC	Collaborative process: moving forward, we need truth.
Saratoga	FC	Continued collaboration needs to address: success will be dependent on whether we get the truth in the future - a matter of trust.
Saratoga	FC	Success is also dependent on the ability to adapt.
Saratoga	FC	We may not have control over decline of the mule deer. Mule deer herds fluctuate.
Saratoga	FC	Mule deer Foundation as a partner
Saratoga	FC	Outfitters as partners.
Saratoga	FC	Learn from existing habitat groups/plans.

Location	Discussion Point	Comment
FC = Future Collaboration. GC = General Comment. M = Missing in the Plan. P=Present Collaboration.		
Saratoga	FC	Voices are heard with collaborative meeting - chance to "reset" public opinion.
Saratoga	FC	PVHP is outstanding idea.
Saratoga	FC	Funding from Colorado: feeding deer.
Saratoga	FC	Prioritize winter range.
Saratoga	FC	Increased funding - identify sources.
Saratoga	FC	Education.
Saratoga	FC	Help cross ownership boundaries on projects through collaboration.
Saratoga	FC	Advertise volunteer opportunities and promote inclusion with federal and private projects.
Saratoga	FC	It's good if it works?
Saratoga	FC	Break-out groups are a good thing.
Saratoga	FC	Habitat biologist in Platte Valley?
Saratoga	FC	Citizen involvement not just for deer, with federal agencies.
Saratoga	FC	Should there be another phone interview?
Saratoga	FC	Is Colorado cooperating with us vs. with them.
Saratoga	FC	How do we establish habitat baseline?
Saratoga	FC	Database on projects that need done in order to get the money to the people who need it.
Saratoga	FC	Forest Service needs input on what areas (prime mule deer resource areas) and roads.
Cheyenne	GC	The plan is complete and detailed.
Cheyenne	GC	How will we measure success?
Cheyenne	GC	White tailed deer: nothing in plan covers WTD competition. What are the interactions between WTD, mule deer and disease?
Cheyenne	GC	Need for definitions in plan e.g. "mitigation".
Cheyenne	GC	Are other agencies as committed to plan as mule deer?
Cheyenne	GC	Like specifics in the plan.
Cheyenne	GC	Is there a conflict between the objectives to increase hunter success vs. decreasing yearling buck harvest?
Cheyenne	GC	Will take time 2-4 or more years to get success. Winters will also impact herd success. May need to explain better to folks that this will take time.
Cheyenne	GC	Road closures (USFS) without notice caused loss of trust with public.
Cheyenne	GC	What's the average age of harvested deer now?
Cheyenne	GC	Do we need mandatory harvest checks/harvest reporting? Do we need a statute/regulation tool for this?

Location	Discussion Point	Comment
FC = Future Collaboration. GC = General Comment. M = Missing in the Plan. P=Present Collaboration.		
Cheyenne	GC	ATV issue needs work: limit use during fawning season/winter range. Push wildlife out of area.
Cheyenne	GC	Add reference to WAFWA energy guidelines and Sawyers' work.
Cheyenne	GC	Add specific timeframes for completion.
Cheyenne	GC	Feed the deer and they'll seed the country.
Cheyenne	GC	ATV enforcement - How can we get WGFD wardens to be able to enforce ATV laws on BLM/USFS?
Cheyenne	GC	Mountain lion predation - will year long season take too many lions?
Cheyenne	GC	Experimental fertilization - coordinate with those that have done it.
Cheyenne	GC	Can deer harvest have that much of an effect on the deer population?
Cheyenne	GC	Can we harvest roadside areas for feed for elk - to bait away from winter range?
Cheyenne	GC	Do we meet mountain lion quotas? Remove as many lions as we can. They will come back. Decrease license price.
Cheyenne	GC	How many deer do lions kill?
Cheyenne	GC	Coyote control - how - humane.
Cheyenne	GC	Mitigation - define better. "mitigation" will not bring deer back.
Cheyenne	GC	Work with public to remove coyotes - give locations needing more coyote harvest. List of people to call.
Cheyenne	GC	Coyote hunting competitions during appropriate times.
Cheyenne	GC	Take care of invasive species. Remove white-tailed deer.
Cheyenne	GC	What are the issues with fences.
Cheyenne	GC	Likes idea of increasing antler spread/ antler size.
Cheyenne	GC	Increase price of license.
Cheyenne	GC	Elk competition with deer.
Cheyenne	GC	Has there been a change in habitat type/vegetation?
Cheyenne	GC	Other sources of funding.
Cheyenne	GC	Data - mortality caused by predators.
Cheyenne	GC	Increase black bear quotas in fawning areas - not entire area.
Cheyenne	GC	Time of year fawns hit the ground - getting longer - why?
Cheyenne	GC	Forest health - why can't they sell wood - bring in \$ \$ better for habitat?
Cheyenne	GC	Range improvements - public relations with other partners to get everyone together.
Cheyenne	GC	Work on getting natural habitat cycle back - work with partners.
Cheyenne	GC	"Let it burn" policy back - allow fires to help.
Cheyenne	GC	Breaking seasons down into smaller increments. Time to hunt.
Cheyenne	GC	Volunteer program - need to get more information out.
Cheyenne	GC	Handicap access - how can we make it work?

Location	Discussion Point	Comment
FC = Future Collaboration. GC = General Comment. M = Missing in the Plan. P=Present Collaboration.		
Cheyenne	GC	Open closed roads to handicapped hunters.
Cheyenne	GC	Effects of cloud seeding, increase moisture on deer herd?
Cheyenne	GC	How will plan be implemented after it's finalized?
Cheyenne	GC	Have parts of the plan already been implemented?
Cheyenne	GC	Can we get parts of this plan associated with mule deer initiative and WGFD show "Call of the Wild"?
Cheyenne	GC	Habitat equipment needs to be emphasized?
Cheyenne	GC	Long-term process - need to get public involvement and recruitment of kinds.
Cheyenne	GC	How did you find out about tonight's meeting: paper, WGFD website, Circulated by NGO's.
Cheyenne	GC	Feedback from outfitters in other venues?
Cheyenne	GC	Will comments go on record?
Cheyenne	GC	What is strategy for incorporating elk management in the plan?
Cheyenne	GC	What is strategy for incorporating special needs in hunting opportunities?
Cheyenne	GC	Do elk really compete with mule deer?
Cheyenne	GC	What effect will beetle kill have on mule deer habitat?
Cheyenne	GC	What harvest data do we currently collect from field/animals?
Laramie	GC	Limited quota - very happy that is in the plan.
Laramie	GC	What kind of info will be provided in brochures/pamphlets.
Laramie	GC	Elk objective - are we going to try to bring elk population to objective?
Laramie	GC	Are eagles a significant predator?
Laramie	GC	Like habitat ideas in plan.
Laramie	GC	Poaching - increase enforcement on winter range and during rut.
Laramie	GC	Poaching - education efforts: how does poaching affect herd?
Laramie	GC	Poaching - ask in surveys if illegal activity witnessed.
Laramie	GC	Need better data on what predator species are killing deer.
Laramie	GC	Develop public data base for proposed habitat projects.
Laramie	GC	Need more baseline data on predators and habitat.
Laramie	GC	Not enough educational component.
Laramie	GC	More emphasis on OHV restriction in winter range.
Laramie	GC	Supplement revenue that may be lost due to OHV restrictions.
Laramie	GC	Need WGFD presence on NGO groups, e.g. MDF, RMEF. Better coordination with NGO's.
Laramie	GC	Antler point restrictions.
Laramie	GC	Base on age of deer rather than spread.
Laramie	GC	I like the proposal to manage predator populations.
Laramie	GC	Would like to see antler point restrictions.

Location	Discussion Point	Comment
FC = Future Collaboration. GC = General Comment. M = Missing in the Plan. P=Present Collaboration.		
Laramie	GC	Want info on LQ distribution - entire area or specific HA?
Laramie	GC	Worried about impact LQ impacts on other herds.
Laramie	GC	Require permits for antler hunting, not just a season.
Laramie	GC	Develop a priority list of research needs with UW.
Laramie	GC	Wants to see time lines for goals and projects.
Laramie	GC	Status of deer herd right now?
Laramie	GC	Should we prioritize most important or limiting habitats to treat first?
Laramie	GC	15 - 20K objective realistic?
Laramie	GC	No detail on limited quota - what is being considered?
Laramie	GC	Will people be notified at future meetings via email?
Laramie	GC	Will WGFD develop and send out a PVMDI newsletter to interested publics?
Laramie	GC	Need firm dates and objectives as plan is implemented.
Rawlins	GC	Excited about process
Rawlins	GC	Get habitat information out to conservation districts.
Rawlins	GC	Question: how does limited quota work, how do we set numbers?
Rawlins	GC	Try limited quota for 5 years.
Rawlins	GC	Why wait for drop in D/F numbers before coordinations with predator board?
Rawlins	GC	Website page to access collared deer information
Rawlins	GC	Monthly flight information.
Rawlins	GC	Introduce birds to assist with cheatgrass/invasive control.
Rawlins	GC	Doe/fawn season with deer - 3 deer for every doe taken.
Rawlins	GC	Educate public so they can educate others - kids: they will educate parents.
Rawlins	GC	All in the group in favor of limited quota, but need to look at deer that are here during hunting season to set quotas or look at time of season.
Rawlins	GC	Make hunter responses to harvest surveys mandatory.
Rawlins	GC	Require mandatory check-in.
Rawlins	GC	More information/education about importance of survey.
Rawlins	GC	Regulated antler hunting season.
Rawlins	GC	Disturbance - if fawning area is shut dwn to human access, may allow more predators to be in the area.
Rawlins	GC	Limited quota entire state with archery only seasons. Black powder - choose your weapon.
Rawlins	GC	Resident preference points.
Rawlins	GC	Antler hunting restrictions by drainage.
Rawlins	GC	Control clover after road construction - reduce road kin (?)
Rawlins	GC	Exchange of use - access for improvement or work on land.
Rawlins	GC	Congrats to WGFD for working with sociologist

Location	Discussion Point	Comment
FC = Future Collaboration. GC = General Comment. M = Missing in the Plan. P=Present Collaboration.		
Rawlins	GC	Include land owners as stakeholder group in PVHP slide and in plan
Rawlins	GC	Length of seasons under limited quota?
Rawlins	GC	Legume seeding point of contact?
Rawlins	GC	Will Colorado migrant deer be considered part of 20,000 objective?
Rawlins	GC	Is CWD impacting population of mule deer?
Saratoga	GC	Why are we managing for recreational hunting vs. special hunting regs?
Saratoga	GC	Public vs. private land ownership, need better marking.
Saratoga	GC	Public lands and education of such.
Saratoga	GC	Don't feel more access to private land will help put more deer on the ground
Saratoga	GC	What is limited quota strategy going to be?
Saratoga	GC	What are the benefits to landowners for granting habitat easements?
Saratoga	GC	What assistance is available to landowners to control cheatgrass?
Saratoga	GC	Add a habitat check-off . Added to license sales. The same as search and rescue. Check off/donation.
Saratoga	GC	Like the limited quota structure.
Saratoga	GC	Let the local game wardens and biologist manage the herd.
Saratoga	GC	Would like to see a \$ statement on what the PVMDI cost per person
Saratoga	GC	Support the predator control outlined in the Plan.
Saratoga	GC	What can landowners do? Use experience.
Saratoga	GC	Habitat/defer ground after treatment.
Saratoga	GC	Preference points - Ron's right.
Saratoga	GC	On-site education on habitat issues.
Saratoga	GC	Six months - meeting on habitat improvement enhancing deer populations tougher than enhancing elk.
Saratoga	GC	Predator control - timing.
Saratoga	GC	Tap into local long-term knowledge.
Saratoga	GC	Burning - timing.
Saratoga	GC	Do not tie habitat to access.
Saratoga	GC	Additional meeting on limited quota before season setting.
Saratoga	GC	Predation is immediate concern.
Saratoga	GC	Want to see components of the draft into action.
Saratoga	GC	Need a season on antler hunting.
Saratoga	GC	Eliminate or manage 4-wheelers - do we need more legislation?
Saratoga	GC	Too much focus on increasing access. Access an issue for later. Limited access actually benefits deer. Deer numbers decreasing on private land as well as public.

Location	Discussion Point	Comment
FC = Future Collaboration. GC = General Comment. M = Missing in the Plan. P=Present Collaboration.		
Saratoga	GC	Encourage WGFD to be as restrictive as possible under general seasons - pop. Mgmt.
Saratoga	GC	Antler point restrictions under General.
Saratoga	GC	How are we going to get cooperation from USFS, landowners?
Saratoga	GC	More emphasis placed on using livestock to improve habitat.
Saratoga	GC	Stress coyote control more in the plan.
Saratoga	GC	More emphasis on legume-seeding- increase payments.
Saratoga	GC	Interspecies competition needs to be stressed.
Saratoga	GC	Increase bitterbrush establishment.
Saratoga	GC	Focus access on reducing elk.
Saratoga	GC	Establish WGFD office in Saratoga during hunting season.
Saratoga	GC	Bear Quota - increase without delay
Saratoga	GC	Hard to grow herd with a limited quota. Good as long as it is restrictive.
Saratoga	GC	Encourage including public in pre-season setting meeting.
Saratoga	GC	Computer model: metrics and methods.
Saratoga	GC	Counts at hunting season rather than winter population.
Saratoga	GC	Season closure.
Saratoga	GC	Antler point restrictions.
Saratoga	GC	Manage deer and elk together.
Saratoga	GC	Access: limit, need security (wildlife), short term.
Saratoga	GC	ATV use - limit.
Saratoga	GC	Emphasize on legumes: planting = working with landowners.
Saratoga	GC	Two conflicting goals: evaluation of habitat - herd objective of 20,000 vs. relative carrying capacity.
Saratoga	GC	Predator changes approved of mountain lion.
Saratoga	GC	Doesn't like antler point restrictions, wanton waste.
Saratoga	GC	Access to public land through private lands
Saratoga	GC	Area 7 and 31 mountain lion are not the problem.
Saratoga	GC	Coyotes are a big problem.
Saratoga	GC	What incentives are available for legume planting? What else is available? Private land project?
Saratoga	GC	Are lions a problem?
Saratoga	GC	More on the coyote kill.
Saratoga	GC	Increase habitat issues.
Saratoga	GC	24 inch is available?
Saratoga	GC	Is access really a problem?
Saratoga	GC	What about elk competing with deer?

Location	Discussion Point	Comment
FC = Future Collaboration. GC = General Comment. M = Missing in the Plan. P=Present Collaboration.		
Saratoga	GC	More seeding at Pennock.
Saratoga	GC	Let cattle on Refuge.
Saratoga	GC	4-wheeler limitations.
Saratoga	GC	Support extending the antler collecting season across the Divide to cover the Platte Valley
Saratoga	GC	Oppose antler season closures because having people accessing the back country in late winter and spring provides an opportunity for recreational harvest of coyotes which could benefit deer
Saratoga	GC	Optimistic about habitat improvements plan/group PVHP
Saratoga	GC	Specifics about improvements. General idea: what is habitat improvement?
Saratoga	GC	Baseline data on antler characteristics. Why don't we have it here?
Saratoga	GC	Trade-off habitat vs. livestock vs. wildlife. Incentives.
Saratoga	GC	Age 18 and younger would be general, everyone else is limited quota.
Saratoga	GC	If it goes to limited quota, we need preference points included.
Saratoga	GC	Do we trust population estimates enough to establish seasons from them?
Saratoga	GC	How many areas would there be?
Saratoga	GC	Questions the order of the process - why was the survey conducted early in the process?
Saratoga	GC	Are attitudes changing as the process progresses?
Saratoga	GC	Draft: too much emphasis on habitat and weed control - is this a good use of funds. Get off your a*** and irrigate the Pennock.
Saratoga	GC	More aggressive predator management: what is the lion quota?
Saratoga	GC	Do we need a quota in 31?
Saratoga	GC	19 deer that were collared, what were their conditions?
Saratoga	GC	Why with a helicopter? Response most efficient use of funds.
Saratoga	GC	How did the collared deer die?
Saratoga	GC	The forest is an ATV hangout/private land is a sanctuary for wildlife.
Saratoga	GC	ATV enforcement
Saratoga	GC	Integrate radio systems between agencies.
Saratoga	GC	Is a habitat person in Saratoga the answer to the habitat issue?
Saratoga	GC	Transferable licenses gives landowner incentive to improve habitat \$\$\$
Saratoga	GC	Is chemical applications the answer to improve habitat.
Saratoga	GC	Lions move mule deer out of habitat. Increase in coyotes over years.
Saratoga	GC	Don't hold the predator projects up with governmental red tape. Keep some flexibility with landowners and predator board.

Location	Discussion Point	Comment
FC = Future Collaboration. GC = General Comment. M = Missing in the Plan. P=Present Collaboration.		
Cheyenne	M	Youth recruitment missing in plan: education in classrooms, scouts, FFA, etc. School district in Cheyenne isn't supportive of kids leaving class for hunting.
Cheyenne	M	Antler point restrictions not in the plan.
Cheyenne	M	Discussion on lost revenue from L.Q. is not in plan.
Cheyenne	M	Cooperation with Colorado is missing in plan.
Cheyenne	M	Encourage predator harvest by public.
Cheyenne	M	Identify research needs.
Cheyenne	M	Consider predator hunting in PLPW areas.
Laramie	M	Increase prominence of livestock grazing as a treatment for habitat.
Laramie	M	Youth- no mention of youth recruitment/retention. Longer season for youth. Look at opportunity to include youth education in classrooms throughout Wyoming communities.
Laramie	M	Look for opportunities to include UW students in wildlife education programs.
Laramie	M	Dedicated poaching part on website - post W.W.P.A. booklet on web.
Rawlins	M	How do we manage white tailed deer in plan?
Rawlins	M	Elk/competition
Rawlins	M	Question: are we working with CDOW?
Rawlins	M	We need to continue to work with CO.
Rawlins	M	Interspecies competition with elk and white tail deer
Rawlins	M	Better access for elk to help with deer numbers, less access for deer/protection.
Rawlins	M	Limited quota makes for quality of the hunt but does not increase population - make this clear in the plan.
Rawlins	M	Look at overpasses for migration include R.R.
Rawlins	M	Limited quota could be higher than general - increase of dollars toward habitat.
Rawlins	M	Coordinate with Colorado or hunting seasons.
Rawlins	M	Continue no doe/fawn hunting till population has increased.
Rawlins	M	Measurable goals and objectives - in plan
Saratoga	M	What is a habitat easement? In relation to conservation easements?
Saratoga	M	Would like to see competition from elk addressed in the plan.
Saratoga	M	What disease identified? Priorities? What are priorities with limited resources?
Saratoga	M	Missed: Choose your weapon.
Saratoga	M	Wording of phone survey "perceived". Decrease insulting to locals who know there was a decrease.
Saratoga	M	Better explain how deer counts are done.
Saratoga	M	Elk competition issue.
Saratoga	M	How are ATV's going to be managed
Saratoga	M	What does WGFD mean when they say "habitat improvement" on the forest?

Location	Discussion Point	Comment
FC = Future Collaboration. GC = General Comment. M = Missing in the Plan. P=Present Collaboration.		
Saratoga	M	Where is the money going to come from to implement these things?
Cheyenne	P	Better advertisement. Send to other organizations. TV
Laramie	P	Pleased with process
Laramie	P	Everybody becomes a stakeholder
Laramie	P	Beneficial to involve the public.
Laramie	P	Good to get different community input.
Laramie	P	Notification problem: need to get word out better to improve attendance. Flyers.
Laramie	P	UW parking is an issue.
Laramie	P	Use Facebook to help notify folks.
Laramie	P	Liked basis idea of plan.
Laramie	P	Concerned with lack of biological data.
Laramie	P	On right track.
Laramie	P	Not enough specifics.
Laramie	P	Liked format: public input.
Laramie	P	Liked partnerships.
Laramie	P	Lack of publicity.
Laramie	P	Continuation of process and involving the public.
Laramie	P	Like limited quota.
Laramie	P	Likes the emergency changes emphasis.
Rawlins	P	Like - educating OHV users make them responsible.
Rawlins	P	Like - breakout groups
Rawlins	P	like - meeting times.
Rawlins	P	Liked the process, now let's follow through.
Rawlins	P	Like user group input and ability to see results.
Rawlins	P	Democracy is an ugly process but good job on follow through.
Rawlins	P	Liked input, not impressed with lack of involvement from other hunters.
Rawlins	P	Like flexible approach.
Saratoga	P	Old computer model is gone (replaced by Sightability Index).
Saratoga	P	Studies e.g. collaring.
Saratoga	P	Impressed with the process - it's candid.
Saratoga	P	Appreciate the candid nature of the discussions.
Saratoga	P	Impressed with the speed of production of the draft.
Saratoga	P	Have to have results or everyone will bail.
Saratoga	P	Drastic steps to justify public's efforts.
Saratoga	P	Supportive of the process.

Location	Discussion Point	Comment
FC = Future Collaboration. GC = General Comment. M = Missing in the Plan. P=Present Collaboration.		
Saratoga	P	WGFD less defensive and more open in this process.
Saratoga	P	Plan well written - captured many different thoughts.
Saratoga	P	Liked public involvement and advertised well.
Saratoga	P	Just having the MDI process.
Saratoga	P	WGFD on public's side and showing concern.
Saratoga	P	Everybody has a say.
Saratoga	P	Break-out groups are great.
Saratoga	P	Hunting season comment: short seasons.
Saratoga	P	This process is five years too late.
Saratoga	P	Good start.
Saratoga	P	Jessica is a good facilitator.
Saratoga	P	Like the game wardens in street clothes.
Saratoga	P	Proof in the pudding is whether the end product matches what we discussed.